

Dear editor,

Thank you for your response and for reviewer's comments on our manuscript entitled "F-box and leucine-rich repeat 6 promote gastric cancer progression via the promotion of epithelial-mesenchymal transition". We have prudently considered your comments and made revisions in the revised mode. We hope that the quality of the manuscript will be certainly improved.

Here is the list of our responses to reviewer's comments.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This is a relevant study assessing the association of FBXL6 expression and GC tissues and cells. The Manuscript is overall fairly well written, however the following amendments are required before proceeding further.

1.Title: Line 8: " Meng et al...." what is it? –

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. This section is the running title.

2.Abstract: the conclusion of the present study is missing. The authors mentioned the potential implication only.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. The specific contents are as follows:

Silencing of FBXL6 inactivated the EMT pathway to suppress GC malignancy in vitro. FBXL6 can potentially be used for the diagnosis and targeted therapy of patients with GC.

3. Method: Is Dr. Ying's laboratory an official name of the institute or the laboratory? If yes, keep it, otherwise, discard.

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have discarded "Dr. Ying's" description.

4.Results: To improve the readability of the paper, it is advisable to put effect size, 95% CIs, alongside the P-value.

Response: Thanks for your comment. we have added this section in our manuscript.

5.Results: Please also clearly indicate both significant and nonsignificant changes. Without effect sizes and P-values, the conclusion sentence at the end of each paragraph is very difficult to follow.

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have rephrased the sentence according to the above suggestion.

6. Results: "we attempted to investigate and elucidate the relationship between FBXL6

and EMT signaling pathway.” The aim of the study should be in the Introduction section but not in the Results section.

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have revised this section in the results section of the manuscript.

7. Discussion: Line 352: “loss of FBXL6 reduces the growth” of what?

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have corrected this problem in the manuscript. The specific contents are as follows:

In the past, studies have reported that the loss of FBXL6 reduces the growth and induces apoptosis in ccRCC cells.

8. Line 370: “Recent studies suggest that FBPs play a vital part in tumorigenesis metastasis. “. Do you mean tumorigenesis AND metastasis? –

Response: Thanks for your comment. We apologize for the mistake in the manuscript. We have modified this sentence.

9. Should be “Yang et al. noted...” instead of “Yang noted...”

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have revised the sentence in our manuscript.

10. Conclusion: please remove “possibly” and also, “the first report” from conclusion. Because this is not the conclusion of the study. Conclusion focuses on the results and implications of the study ONLY. I believe that the aim of this study was not to prove that the present study was the first of its kind.

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have modified this part of the conclusion.

11. Conclusion: important but nonsignificant results should also be mentioned in the Conclusion.

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have revised this part of the conclusion in our manuscript

12. Grammatical mistakes throughout. It is advisable to use a professional English editing service or please revise them carefully.

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have further polished the language as you suggested.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This is a well-designed paper. It researches the role of FBXL6 in the progression of gastric cancer in vitro and in vivo. However, some minor revision need to be performed before publication.

1. The Statistical methods of Bioinformatic analysis ought to be described more detailedly.

Response: Thanks for your kind suggestion. We have redescrbed the Statistical methods of Bioinformatic analysis in our manuscript.

2. The contents of Table 1 should be presented in the form of a forest map for better reading.

Response: Thanks for your kind suggestion. Based on your suggestions, we have presented the contents of Table 1 in the form of a forest map in Figure 1F.

We sincerely hope that this revised manuscript has addressed all your comments and suggestions. We appreciated for reviewers' warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval. Once again, thank you very much for your comments.

Kind regards,

Aman Xu

E-mail: amanxu1965@163.com